

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 6, 2003. Claims 28, 32-35, 42, and 46-57 are presented for examination, of which Claims 28 and 42 are in independent form. Claims 28, 45, 46, and 52 have been amended to define Applicants' invention more clearly. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 28, 32-35, 42, and 46-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,195,068 (*Suzuki et al.*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,717,496 (*Satoh et al.*) and U.S. Patent No. 6,064,398 (*Ellenby et al.*).

As shown above, Applicants have amended independent Claims 28 and 42 in terms that more clearly define the present invention. Applicants submit that these amended independent claims, together with the claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

An aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 28 is directed to an imaging apparatus that includes first and second communication interfaces and a control unit. The first communication interface conforms to a first communication standard, and the second communication interface conforms to a second communication standard different from the first communication standard. The control unit sets one of the first and second communication interfaces in a passive state, which cannot be used to communicate with another apparatus, if the other of the first and second communication interfaces is set in an active state, which can be used to communicate with another apparatus.

*Suzuki et al.*, as understood by Applicants, relates to an image display system

for transferring image data converted into bit map data from an upper apparatus, such as a personal computer or the like, to a display apparatus for displaying an image. *Satoh et al.*, as understood by Applicants, relates to an electronic imaging apparatus capable of transmitting image data, and *Ellenby et al.* is understood by Applicants to relate to image augmentation in combination with navigation, position, and attitude devices.

Applicants submit that a combination of *Suzuki et al.*, *Satoh et al.*, and *Ellenby et al.*, assuming such combination would even be permissible, would fail to teach or suggest an imaging apparatus that includes a control unit, which sets one of first and second communication interfaces in a passive state, which cannot be used to communicate with another apparatus, if the other of the first and second communication interfaces is set in an active state, which can be used to communicate with another apparatus, as claimed in Claim 28.

Apparently, *Suzuki et al.* discloses a mode switch 145 that switches between three display modes. In mode 1, both a drawing controller 46 and a display controller 140 operate, such that a display of a printer image picture plane by a drawing of a first display unit 310 and a display of a PC picture plane by a drawing of a second liquid crystal unit 320 are executed. When mode 2 is selected by the mode switch 145, the drawing controller 46 operates, a display controller 146 is turned off, and only the printer image picture plane is displayed by a first liquid crystal unit 310. When mode 3 is selected by the mode switch 145, the display controller 140 operates, the drawing controller 46 is turned off, and only the PC picture plane is displayed by the second liquid crystal unit 320 (see column 18, lines 43-64).

According to *Suzuki et al.*, in mode 2 the drawing controller 46 operates and

the display controller 140 is turned off, while in mode 3 the display controller 140 operates and the drawing controller 46 is turned off. That is, *Suzuki et al.* is understood to merely disclose changing the status of the drawing controller 46 and the display controller 140 according to the selected mode.

Nothing has been found in *Suzuki et al.* that is believed to teach or suggest a control unit that sets one of the first and second communication interfaces in a passive state, which cannot be used to communicate with another apparatus, if the other of the first and second communication interfaces is set in an active state, which can be used to communicate with another apparatus, as claimed in claim 28. That is, *Suzuki et al.* fails to disclose or suggest changing the status of either the drawing controller 46 or the display controller 140 according to the status of the other controller. Accordingly, *Suzuki et al.* fails to disclose or suggest that the status of one of first and second communication interfaces is changed according to the status of the other of the first and second communication interfaces.

Further, at page 2 of the Office Action, it is specifically conceded that *Suzuki et al.* fails to disclose interfaces being associated with communication standards and a first/second interface.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants submit that Claim 28 is clearly allowable over *Suzuki et al.*, taken alone.

The Office Action cites *Satoh et al.* and *Ellenby et al.* as overcoming the deficiencies of *Suzuki et al.* However, neither *Satoh et al.* nor *Ellenby et al.* is seen to add anything to overcome the deficiency of *Suzuki et al.* with respect to a control unit that sets one of

first and second communication interfaces in a passive state, which cannot be used to communicate with another apparatus, if the other of the first and second communication interfaces is set in an active state, which can be used to communicate with another apparatus, as claimed in Claim 28. Therefore, even if *Suzuki et al.*, *Satoh et al.*, and *Ellenby et al.* were to be combined in the manner proposed in the Office Action, assuming such combination would even be permissible, the resulting combination also would fail to teach or suggest the feature of Claim 28 discussed above.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 28 is patentable over *Suzuki et al.*, *Satoh et al.*, and *Ellenby et al.*, considered separately or in combination, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Independent Claim 42 is a method claim corresponding to claim 28, and is believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or the other of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Attorney for Applicants  
Locksers & JAFFERS  
Registration No. 38,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_MAIN 328308v1